Amendments to the Claims:

Following is a complete listing of the claims pending in the application, as amended, which replaces all prior versions and listings of claims in the application:

1-10.   (Canceled)

11.   (Original) A method in a computing device for selecting information to provide to users based on reputations of evaluators of the information, the method comprising:

receiving from a reviewer user a review related to an available item;

receiving evaluations of the review from each of multiple evaluator users, each received evaluation including a quantitative assessment of contents of the review for each of one or more of multiple content rating dimensions available for use in assessing the review, each of the evaluator users having an existing reputation weight based at least in part on previous evaluations;

automatically generating at least one aggregate assessment of the content of the review based at least in part on combining quantitative assessments from the received evaluations for the review, at least one of the generated aggregate assessments being further based on the reputation weights of the evaluator users in such a manner that a first quantitative assessment from a first evaluator user with a first reputation weight has a different impact on that generated aggregate assessment than that first quantitative assessment from a distinct second evaluator user with a distinct second reputation weight;

automatically updating the reputation weights for each of one or more of the evaluator users based on a relationship of the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of that evaluator user to the quantitative assessments from the evaluations of other of the evaluator users; and

determining whether to provide the review to another user based at least in part on one or more of the automatically generated aggregate assessments for the content of the review.

12.   (Original) The method of claim 11 including, before the automatic updating of the reputation weights of the one or more evaluator users, determining whether the received evaluations satisfy an evaluator reputation calculation threshold, and wherein the automatic

updating of the reputation weights of the one or more evaluator users is performed only when it is determined that the received evaluations satisfy the evaluator reputation calculation threshold.

13.   (Original) The method of claim 12 wherein the evaluator reputation calculation threshold is based at least in part on a minimum degree of consensus existing among the received evaluations, and wherein the determining includes automatically calculating the existing degree of consensus among the received evaluations.

14.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein the relationship of the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of an evaluator user to the quantitative assessments from the evaluations of other of the evaluator users that is used when automatically updating the reputation weight for that evaluator user is based on a degree of agreement between the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of the evaluator user and quantitative assessments from a consensus evaluation for the received evaluations.

15.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein the reputation weights of the evaluator users that are used in the automatic generating of the aggregate assessments of the content of the review were automatically generated based on the previous evaluations by those evaluator users.

16.   (Original) The method of claim 11 including, after the receiving of the evaluations from the evaluator users, for each of at least some of the evaluations receiving one or more ratings of the evaluation from users other than the evaluator user that provided the evaluation, and automatically modifying the reputation weights for evaluator users whose evaluations received ratings based at least in part on those ratings.

17.   (Original) The method of claim 11 including, after the automatic updating of the reputation weights of the one or more evaluator users, receiving an indication that the content is no longer in use for determining reputation weights of the evaluator users, and automatically updating the reputation weights for each of those evaluator users to remove influence based on the relationship of the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of that evaluator user to the quantitative assessments from the evaluations of other of the evaluator users.

18.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein the automatic generating of the aggregate assessments of the content of the review is further based in part on an existing reputation weight of the reviewer user from which the review was received.

19.   (Original) The method of claim 18 wherein the reputation weight of the reviewer user is based on a degree of consistency between one or more of the automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of the review and automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of previous reviews received from the reviewer user.

20.   (Original) The method of claim 11 including automatically updating a reputation weight of the reviewer user from which the review was received based at least in part on one or more of the automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of the review.

21.   (Original) The method of claim 20 including, before the automatic updating of the reputation weight of the reviewer user, determining whether the received evaluations satisfy an author reputation calculation threshold, and wherein the automatic updating of the reputation weight of the reviewer user is performed only when it is determined that the received evaluations satisfy the author reputation calculation threshold.

22.   (Original) The method of claim 11 including, before the automatic generating of the aggregate assessments of the content of the review, determining whether the received evaluations satisfy a content rating threshold, and wherein the automatic generating of the aggregate assessments of the content of the review is performed only when it is determined that the received evaluations satisfy the content rating threshold.

23.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim ~~21~~ 22 wherein the content rating threshold is based at least in part on a weighted number of the evaluations received for the review from the evaluator users that is based on the reputation weights of the evaluator users in such a manner that an evaluation from a first evaluator user with a first reputation weight has a different impact on that weighted number of evaluations than an evaluation from a distinct second evaluator user with a distinct second reputation weight.

4

24.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein each of the received evaluations include quantitative assessments of the contents of the review for each of the multiple available content rating dimensions.

25.   (Original) The method of claim 24 including, before the receiving of the evaluations of the review, determining the multiple available content rating dimensions.

26.   (Original) The method of claim 11 including, before the receiving of the evaluations of the review, soliciting the evaluator users to provide evaluations of the review, the solicitations including indications of the multiple available content rating dimensions.

27.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein the automatic generating of the aggregate assessments of the content of the review includes generating an aggregate assessment for each of the multiple available content rating dimensions.

28.   (Original) The method of claim 27 including automatically generating an overall aggregate assessment of the review based at least in part on the automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of the review.

29.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein the automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of the review are each further based on a sales weighting for each of one or more of the evaluator users, the sales weighting of an evaluator user reflecting an amount of prior sales to that evaluator user.

30.   (Original) The method of claim 11 including, after the automatic updating of the reputation weights for the evaluator users, ranking each evaluator user relative to other evaluator users based at least in part on automatically generated evaluator reputation scores of those evaluator users.

31.   (Original) The method of claim 30 wherein the reputation weight for each of the evaluator users is based on a combination of quantity and quality of evaluations provided by that

evaluator user, and including automatically generating a distinct evaluator reputation rating score for each of the evaluator users based solely on the quality of the evaluations provided by that evaluator user, and wherein the evaluator reputation scores used for the ranking are the evaluator reputation rating scores.

32.   (Original) The method of claim 30 including providing visible feedback to users of the rankings of at least some of the evaluator users.

33.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein at least some of the evaluator users each have multiple existing reputation weights that correspond to previous evaluations by those evaluator users of content of different categories, and including, before the automatic updating of the reputation weights for the evaluator users, determining a category of the review, and wherein the automatic updating of the reputation weights of evaluator users that have multiple existing reputation weights is performed for an existing reputation weight of that evaluator user for the determined category.

34.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein at least some of the evaluator users each have multiple existing reputation weights that correspond to different types of activities previously performed by those evaluator users, and wherein the automatic updating of the reputation weights of evaluator users that have multiple existing reputation weights is performed for an existing reputation weight of that evaluator user corresponding to prior review evaluation activities of that evaluator user.

35.   (Original) The method of claim 11 including, after the automatic updating of the reputation weights for the evaluator users, providing indications of the reputation weights for one or more of those evaluator users to one or more third-party computing devices so that they can interact with those evaluator users based on those reputation weights.

36.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein the method is performed by the computing device on behalf of another computing system with whom the evaluator users are interacting, the method performed as a service to the another computing system.

37.   (Original) The method of claim 11 including receiving from one or more third-party computing devices information related to the reputations of one or more of the evaluator users, the received information based on interactions of those evaluator users with those third-party computing devices, and automatically updating the reputation weights for each of those evaluator users based on the received information.

38.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein the review is information obtained from a blog authored by the reviewer user.

39-48. (Canceled)

49.   (New) A computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computing device to select information to provide to users based on reputations of evaluators of the information, by performing a method comprising:

receiving from a reviewer user a review related to an available item;

receiving evaluations of the review from each of multiple evaluator users, each received evaluation including a quantitative assessment of contents of the review for each of one or more of multiple content rating dimensions available for use in assessing the review, each of the evaluator users having an existing reputation weight based at least in part on previous evaluations;

automatically generating at least one aggregate assessment of the content of the review based at least in part on combining quantitative assessments from the received evaluations for the review, at least one of the generated aggregate assessments being further based on the reputation weights of the evaluator users in such a manner that a first quantitative assessment from a first evaluator user with a first reputation weight has a different impact on that generated aggregate assessment than that first quantitative assessment from a distinct second evaluator user with a distinct second reputation weight;

automatically updating the reputation weights for each of one or more of the evaluator users based on a relationship of the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of that evaluator user to the quantitative assessments from the evaluations of other of the evaluator users; and

determining whether to provide the review to another user based at least in part on one or more of the automatically generated aggregate assessments for the content of the review.

50.   (New) The computer-readable medium of claim 49 wherein the relationship of the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of an evaluator user to the quantitative assessments from the evaluations of other of the evaluator users that is used when automatically updating the reputation weight for that evaluator user is based on a degree of agreement between the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of the evaluator user and quantitative assessments from a consensus evaluation for the received evaluations.

51.   (New) The computer-readable medium of claim 49 wherein the reputation weights of the evaluator users that are used in the automatic generating of the at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review are automatically generated based on the previous evaluations by those evaluator users.

52.   (New) The computer-readable medium of claim 49 wherein the automatic generating of the at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review is further based in part on an existing reputation weight of the reviewer user from which the review was received.

53.   (New) The computer-readable medium of claim 52 wherein the existing reputation weight of the reviewer user is based on a degree of consistency between one or more of the automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of the review and automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of previous reviews received from the reviewer user, and wherein the method further comprises automatically updating the reputation weight of the reviewer user from which the review was received based at least in part on one or more of the automatically generated at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review.

54.   (New) The computer-readable medium of claim 49 wherein the method further comprises, before the automatic generating of the at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review, determining whether the received evaluations satisfy a content rating

threshold, and wherein the automatic generating of the at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review is performed only when it is determined that the received evaluations satisfy the content rating threshold.

55.   (New) The computer-readable medium of claim 49 wherein each of the received evaluations include quantitative assessments of the contents of the review for each of the multiple available content rating dimensions.

56.   (New) The computer-readable medium of claim 49 wherein the automatic generating of the at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review includes generating multiple aggregate assessments that are each for one of the multiple available content rating dimensions, and wherein the method further comprises automatically generating an overall aggregate assessment of the review based at least in part on the multiple automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of the review.

57.   (New) The computer-readable medium of claim 49 wherein the computer-readable medium is at least one of a memory of a computing device and a data transmission medium transmitting a generated data signal containing the contents.

58.   (New) The computer-readable medium of claim 49 wherein the contents are instructions that when executed cause the computing device to perform the method.

59.   (New) A computing device for selecting information to provide to users based on reputations of evaluators of the information, comprising:

    one or more memories;

    a content rater component configured to:

        receive from a reviewer user a review related to an available item;

        receive evaluations of the review from each of multiple evaluator users, each received evaluation including a quantitative assessment of contents of the review for each of one or more of multiple content rating dimensions available for use in assessing the review, each of

the evaluator users having an existing reputation weight based at least in part on previous evaluations; and

automatically generate at least one aggregate assessment of the content of the review based at least in part on combining quantitative assessments from the received evaluations for the review, at least one of the generated aggregate assessments being further based on the reputation weights of the evaluator users in such a manner that a first quantitative assessment from a first evaluator user with a first reputation weight has a different impact on that generated aggregate assessment than that first quantitative assessment from a distinct second evaluator user with a distinct second reputation weight;

an evaluator reputation assessor component configured to automatically update the reputation weights for each of one or more of the evaluator users based on a relationship of the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of that evaluator user to the quantitative assessments from the evaluations of other of the evaluator users; and

a content manager system configured to determine whether to provide the review to another user based at least in part on one or more of the automatically generated aggregate assessments for the content of the review.

60.   (New) The computing device of claim 59 wherein the relationship of the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of an evaluator user to the quantitative assessments from the evaluations of other of the evaluator users that is used when automatically updating the reputation weight for that evaluator user is based on a degree of agreement between the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of the evaluator user and quantitative assessments from a consensus evaluation for the received evaluations.

61.   (New) The computing device of claim 59 wherein the reputation weights of the evaluator users that are used in the automatic generating of the at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review are automatically generated based on the previous evaluations by those evaluator users.

62.   (New) The computing device of claim 59 wherein the automatic generating of the at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review is further based in part on an existing reputation weight of the reviewer user from which the review was received.

63.   (New) The computing device of claim 62 wherein the existing reputation weight of the reviewer user is based on a degree of consistency between one or more of the automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of the review and automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of previous reviews received from the reviewer user, and wherein the evaluator reputation assessor component is further configured to automatically update the reputation weight of the reviewer user from which the review was received based at least in part on one or more of the automatically generated at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review.

64.   (New) The computing device of claim 59 wherein the content rater component is further configured to, before the automatic generating of the at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review, determine whether the received evaluations satisfy a content rating threshold, and wherein the automatic generating of the at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review is performed only when it is determined that the received evaluations satisfy the content rating threshold.

65.   (New) The computing device of claim 59 wherein each of the received evaluations include quantitative assessments of the contents of the review for each of the multiple available content rating dimensions.

66.   (New) The computing device of claim 59 wherein the automatic generating of the at least one aggregate assessments of the content of the review includes generating multiple aggregate assessments that are each for one of the multiple available content rating dimensions, and wherein the content rater component is further configured to automatically generate an overall aggregate assessment of the review based at least in part on the multiple automatically generated aggregate assessments of the content of the review.

67.   (New) The computing device of claim 59 wherein the content rater component and the evaluator reputation assessor component each include software instructions for execution in memory of the computing device.

68.   (New) The computing device of claim 59 wherein the content rater component consists of means for receiving from a reviewer user a review related to an available item, for receiving evaluations of the review from each of multiple evaluator users, each received evaluation including a quantitative assessment of contents of the review for each of one or more of multiple content rating dimensions available for use in assessing the review, each of the evaluator users having an existing reputation weight based at least in part on previous evaluations, and for automatically generating at least one aggregate assessment of the content of the review based at least in part on combining quantitative assessments from the received evaluations for the review, at least one of the generated aggregate assessments being further based on the reputation weights of the evaluator users in such a manner that a first quantitative assessment from a first evaluator user with a first reputation weight has a different impact on that generated aggregate assessment than that first quantitative assessment from a distinct second evaluator user with a distinct second reputation weight, wherein the evaluator reputation assessor component consists of means for automatically updating the reputation weights for each of one or more of the evaluator users based on a relationship of the quantitative assessments from the evaluation of that evaluator user to the quantitative assessments from the evaluations of other of the evaluator users, and wherein the content manager system consists of means for determining whether to provide the review to another user based at least in part on one or more of the automatically generated aggregate assessments for the content of the review.